arXiv:1703.02749v1 [quant-ph] 8 Mar 2017

On Non-Markovianity of Qubit Evolution under Action of Spin Environment

Dipanjan Mandal,[1,*] Sagnik Chakraborty,[2,†] Arindam Mallick,[2,‡] and Sibasish Ghosh[2,§]

[1] *The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, HBNI, C. I. T. Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600113, India*

[2] *Optics and Quantum Information Group, The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, HBNI, C. I. T. Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600113, India*

In open system dynamics, a very important feature is the Markovianity or non-Markovianity of the environment i.e., whether there is any feedback of information into the system from the environment that has been previously transferred from the system. We have considered a toy model here, with a qubit acting as a system and an environment consisting of a collection of non-interacting qubits. Following the idea of Rivas et al. we device a non-Markovianity witness for the model. An ancilla qubit (which is not a part of the environment) is attached to the system and the the system-ancilla joint state is initially set to a maximally entangled state. Departure from monotonicity of the decay of this entanglement decay on interaction with the environment serves as a Witness of non-Markovianity. We examine the system-environment dynamics of our model for different types of coupling of the system qubit with the individual environment qubits. We find that for a time-independent coupling, any functional form of coupling will give rise to non-Markovianity. For space-independent coupling, our Witness detects that polynomial coupling will give rise to non-Markovianity. Also for space-independent exponential coupling, non-Markovianity can be witnessed in certain regions of parameter values. We further analyse space and time-dependent coupling for some special cases and find extremal values of the coupling parameter that will give rise to non-Markovianity. These extremal values can be seen as transition values from fully non-Markovian to possibly Markovian dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION :

We rarely come across systems that are completely isolated from the surrounding world. Had it always been the case, solving quantum mechanical problems would have been lot more easier. So, although arduous to deal with, real systems are mostly open systems – a system interacting with an environment. In these situations information exchange between system and environment becomes an essential feature. Information that has been previously transferred to the environment may come back and affect the system, and this may appear as a memory-effect on the system. When this information back-flow from environment is negligible, we have a situation analogous to discrete Markov process where the instantaneous state of the system depends solely on the immediately previous step, the system dynamics is then called memory-less or Markovian process [1, 2]. On the other hand, when this information back-flow affects the system significantly i.e., when some long past history of the system can influence it's present state, the system dynamics is referred to as non-Markovian.

Historically, Markovian open system dynamics came through optical master equations [3]. Although any Markovian dynamics is known to satisfy the physicality property (namely, complete positivity) allowed by Quantum Mechanics, several of the phenomenological non-Markovian dynamics, appeared so far in the literature [4, 5], lacks such physicality. As a result of that, it is important to verify non-Markovianity of any open system dynamics before using them anywhere else.

In recent years, non-Markovianity has been prescribed as a resource for channel discrimination problem [6], preserving coherence [7], controlling work extraction from thermodynamical systems [8], etc. Non-Markovian effects also play important roles in areas ranging from fundamental physics of strong fields [9, 10] to energy transfer process of photosynthetic complexes [11]. Recently, researchers are focusing on transition from non-Markovian to Markovian dynamics as a function of system-bath coupling and bath size [12–15]. Some of them have dealt with bosonic bath of infinite or finite degrees of freedom, while using some amount of approximation in defining environment, and some have used qudit system as environment. But all have considered system-environment interaction to be homogeneous in space and none have addressed the issue of the aforesaid transition in terms of ancilla-sytem entanglement measure.

In our study, we deal with a simple model where a qubit, acting as a system, interacts with an environment consisting of a few non-interacting qubits. We vary the coupling strength of the system with different environment-qubits and analyse its effect on non-Markovianity of the system dynamics. Following the approach by Rivas et al. [16], we attach an additional ancilla qubit to the system and set the initial joint state of the system-ancilla as a maximally entangled state. As the environment interacts with the system, the entanglement between the system and the ancilla begins to decay. We examine the nature of decay of this en-

*Electronic address: mdipanjan@imsc.res.in
†Electronic address: csagnik@imsc.res.in
‡Electronic address: marindam@imsc.res.in
§Electronic address: sibasish@imsc.res.in



FIG. 1: Schematic diagram of system qubit and ancilla qubit, sharing a maximally entangled state $|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|11\rangle + |00\rangle)$. The system is interacting with an environment, consisting of finite number of qubits.

tanglement over time. If the decay of entanglement departs from monotonicity the dynamics is non-Markovian. This departure from monotonicity serves as a Witness for non-Markovianity. We present three scenarios: (I) the system-environment coupling is time-independent but may vary over different environment qubits, (II) the coupling is same for all environment qubits but may vary with time, and (III) the coupling is both time dependent and varies with environment qubits. We find case (I) always gives rise to non-Markovian system dynamics. Certain forms of coupling for certain coupling parameter values for case (II) and case (III), give rise to non-Markovian dynamics. Specifically, in case (II), polynomial forms is always non-Markovian and exponential coupling is non-Markovian for certain parameter values. For case (III) we find the extremal values of the coupling parameters which give rise to non-Markovianity. Beyond those values the Witness fails to capture non-Markovianity, if present, and we see these extremal values act as critical values for transition from fully non-Markovian to possibly Markovian regime.

The paper is organized as follows. In section II, we first describe our model Hamiltonian for the system and environment and initial system-ancilla state. Then by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian we find out the evolution operator, thereby finding the time-evolved state of the system. In section III, characterization of non-Markovianity is given and then a description of our Witness is presented. We present different scenarios for different forms of the coupling. In subsection III C, we also give a description of the simulation technique. Finally in section IV, we draw our conclusions.

II. SYSTEM-ENVIRONMENT HAMILTONIAN :

In our model both the system and the ancilla consists of qubits having joint Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{H}_s \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, and their initial state is the maximally entangled state

$$\rho_{as}(0) = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)(\langle 00| + \langle 11|). \tag{1}$$

The environment consists of N number of non-interacting qubits [see Figure 1]. The system-environment interaction Hamiltonian, acting on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_s \otimes \mathcal{H}_e \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes N}$, may be time-dependent in general is chosen in the form,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{se}(t) &= \hbar\alpha\Big[|1\rangle_s \langle 0| \otimes \sum_{n=1}^{N} g_n^*(t) \, |0..0_n..0\rangle_e \langle 0..1_n..0| \\ &+ |0\rangle_s \langle 1| \otimes \sum_{n=1}^{N} g_n(t) \, |0..1_n..0\rangle_e \langle 0..0_n..0| \Big], \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where coupling strength $g_n(t)$ is in general time-dependent and site-dependent, and α is a real parameter that scales with the interaction strength. So, although a toy model, it depicts a physical scenario where a two-level system releases an energy quantum that excites the nth $(n = 1, 2, .., N)$ qubit of the environment which is in the ground state. The reverse phenomenon happens when a quantum of energy is released by an exited qubit of the environment provided all other environment qubits are in the ground state. The strength $g_n(t)$ of the coupling that causes this exchange, changes with environment site n and also with time t.

Before we list down the eigenvectors of $H_{se}(t)$, we identify the N-qubit state $|x\rangle$ as the product state $|x_1\rangle \otimes |x_2\rangle \otimes .. \otimes |x_N\rangle$ where x is a decimal number given by $x = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} 2^k x_k$. Here $x_0, x_1, .., x_N \in \{0, 1\}$. The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of this Hamiltonian are given below:

1. **Eigenvectors corresponding to non-zero eigenvalues:**

   There are two non-zero eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian given by,

   $$\mathcal{E}_{\pm}(t) = \pm\hbar\alpha\sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{N} |g_n(t)|^2} = \pm\mathcal{E}(t) \text{ (say)}. \tag{3}$$

   Note that, the eigenvalues are time-dependent. The eigenvectors corresponding to them are respectively,

   $$|\chi_{\pm}(t)\rangle_{se} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big[|1\rangle_s \otimes |0\rangle_e^{\otimes N} \pm |\xi(t)\rangle_{se} \big], \tag{4}$$

   where $|\xi(t)\rangle_{se} = |0\rangle_s \otimes |\beta_0\rangle_e$ and

   $$|\beta_0\rangle_e = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{N} |g_n(t)|^2}} \sum_{n=1}^{N} g_n(t) \, |0..1_n..0\rangle_e .$$

2. **Null space eigenvectors :**

   The remaining $(2^{N+1}-2)$ number of the eigenvalues are zero. A possible choice for these null space eigenvectors are the following pairwise orthonormal vectors:

   - $|0\rangle_s \otimes |0\rangle_e^{\otimes N}$,
   - $|\phi_q\rangle_{se} = |0\rangle_s \otimes |\beta_q\rangle_e$, where $q = 1, 2, .., (N-1)$. Here, $\{|\beta_0\rangle_e, |\beta_1\rangle_e, ..., |\beta_{N-1}\rangle_e\}$ forms an orthonormal basis for the subspace spanned by N vectors $\{|10...0\rangle_e, |01...0\rangle_e, ..., |00...1\rangle_e\}$.
   - $|u_j\rangle_{se} = |0\rangle_s \otimes |b_j\rangle_e$, where $j = 1, .., (2^N - N - 1)$. Here b_j is the binary expression for the decimal numbers $3, .., (2^N - 1)$ except the numbers that can be expressed as integer powers of 2.
   - $|v_r\rangle_{se} = |1\rangle_s \otimes |a_r\rangle_e$, where $r = 1, .., (2^N - 1)$. Here a_r is the binary expression for $1, 2, 3, ..., (2^N - 1)$.

The ancilla qubit is not going through any kind of direct evolution, i.e., there is no self Hamiltonian acting on the ancilla. Similarly, neither the system nor the environment have any free Hamiltonian. Thus we can assume that individual strengths of their free evolution are quite small compared to that of the interaction, Hamiltonian $H_{se}(t)$. The initial state of the environment is given by the following thermal state of N qubits

$$\rho_e(0) = \Big[p\,|0\rangle\langle 0| + (1-p)\,|1\rangle\langle 1|\Big]^{\otimes N}, \tag{5}$$

where $p = \left(1 + e^{-\beta}\right)^{-1}$ and β is a positive real parameter which can be identified with inverse of temperature (defined as the temperature of the thermal state) of the environment. The initial state of the whole system is given by, $\rho_{ase}(0) = \rho_{as}(0) \otimes \rho_e(0)$. Therefore the time-evolved state of the whole system is given by,

$$\rho_{ase}(t) = \big\{\mathbb{I}_a \otimes U_{se}(t,0)\big\}\rho_{ase}(0)\big\{\mathbb{I}_a \otimes U_{se}^{\dagger}(t,0)\big\} \quad , \tag{6}$$

where $\mathbb{I}_a$ is an identity operator acting only on the ancilla, $U_{se}(t,0)$ is the time ordered integration of the interaction Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{se}(t,0) &= \mathcal{T}exp\Big[-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^t H_{se}(\tau')\ d\tau'\Big] \\ &= \lim_{m\to\infty}\Bigg[exp\Big[-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{(m-1)\tau}^{m\tau} H_{se}(\tau')\ d\tau'\Big] \\ &\times\ exp\Big[-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{(m-2)\tau}^{(m-1)\tau} H_{se}(\tau')\ d\tau'\Big] \times ... \\ &\times\ exp\Big[-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^{\tau} H_{se}(\tau')\ d\tau'\Big]\Bigg], \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\tau = t/m$, for any finite time t and m is an integer.

Therefore, time-evolved reduced system-ancilla state can be calculated after tracing out the environment part and is given by :

$$\rho_{as}(t) = \mathrm{Tr}_e\Big[\big\{\mathbb{I}_a \otimes U_{se}(t,0)\big\}\rho_{ase}(0)\big\{\mathbb{I}_a \otimes U_{se}^{\dagger}(t,0)\big\}\Big]. \tag{8}$$

III. EVOLUTION OF ANCILLA-SYSTEM ENTANGLEMENT, A MEASURE OF NON-MARKOVIANITY :

We present here a brief description of Markovian and non-Markovian processes. The idea of Markovianity comes from classical markov chains, which is basically an ordered stochastic process, where the probability of an outcome in some specific step depends only on the state of the immediately previous step. Following this, there has been generalization for continuous time stochastic processes and the idea of Markovianity for such processes is already a well known notion [2]. It is, in general, difficult to make a direct generalization of classical Markovian processes into quantum Markovian processes. The approach we take here is to define Markovianity in terms of Divisibility of a dynamical process. A dynamical process given by trace preserving super-operator $\Xi_{(t_2,t_1)}$, representing an evolution from time t_1 to t_2, is said to be Markovian or Divisible if, $\Xi_{(t_2,t_1)}$ is a completely positive map and the following composition law [2] is obeyed

$$\Xi_{(t_3,t_1)} = \Xi_{(t_3,t_2)} \circ \Xi_{(t_2,t_1)}, \tag{9}$$

for any $t_3 > t_2 > t_1$. Here $\circ$ denotes composition.

Following this definition of Markovianity, Rivas et al. [16] devised a measure of non-Markovianity, where a connection between system-ancilla entanglement decay and non-Markovianity was used. The degree of deviation from monotonicity of the entanglement decay curve was taken as the measure of non-Markovianity. Evidently, this idea can be easily extended to define a non-Markovianity Witness. We say that non-Markovianity has been witnessed whenever the entanglement decay curve shows a departure from monotonicity.

To calculate the entanglement between system qubit and ancilla qubit we use the Peres-Horodecki's necessary and sufficient criterion [17, 18] for two-qubit entangled state. We take partial transposition of $\rho_{as}(t)$ with respect to the system, $[\rho_{as}(t)]^{T_s}$. The only negative eigenvalue $\lambda(t)$ [19], if any, of $[\rho_{as}(t)]^{T_s}$ quantifies the entanglement. We will use the modulus of this negative eigenvalue $|\lambda(t)|$ as a measure of entanglement and if all the eigenvalues are positive semidefinite we will consider entanglement measure to be zero.

A. Case I : Coupling, function of site and independent of time :

We start our analysis by considering the case when the coupling coefficients $g_n(t)$ in Eq. (2) is any arbi-

trary function of site n and independent of time. Physical systems like solid state lattices may exhibit this type of coupling. Hence $\mathcal{E}_{\pm}(t) = \pm\mathcal{E}$ in Eq. (3) are constants in time. Also the Hamiltonian operators in Eq. (2) at different times, mutually commute. Therefore, the time-ordered integration in Eq. (7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} U_{se}(t_2,t_1) &= e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{t_1}^{t_2} H_{se}\, d\tau} \\ &= e^{-\frac{i\mathcal{E}}{\hbar}(t_2-t_1)} |\chi_+\rangle_{se} \langle\chi_+| \\ &+ e^{\frac{i\mathcal{E}}{\hbar}(t_2-t_1)} |\chi_-\rangle_{se} \langle\chi_-| + |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes(N+1)} \\ &+ \sum_q |\phi_q\rangle_{se} \langle\phi_q| + \sum_j |u_j\rangle_{se} \langle u_j| \\ &+ \sum_r |v_r\rangle_{se} \langle v_r| . \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Therefore, from the Eq. (6) and (8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{as}(t) &= \frac{1}{2}\Bigg[\left(1 - p^{N-1}(1-p)\sin^2(\omega t)\right)|00\rangle_{as}\langle 00| \\ &+ \left[1 - 2p^{N-1}\sin^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right)\right]|00\rangle_{as}\langle 11| \\ &+ \left[1 - 2p^{N-1}\sin^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right)\right]|11\rangle_{as}\langle 00| \\ &+ \left(1 - p^{N}\sin^2(\omega t)\right)|11\rangle_{as}\langle 11| \\ &+ p^{N-1}(1-p)\sin^2(\omega t)|01\rangle_{as}\langle 01| \\ &+ p^{N}\sin^2(\omega t)|10\rangle_{as}\langle 10|\Bigg], \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\omega = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\hbar}$. The only possible negative eigenvalue, if any, of $[\rho_{as}(t)]^{T_s}$ is of the form:

$$\lambda(t) = \frac{1}{2}\left[C_1\sin^2(\omega t) - \sqrt{1 + C_2\sin^4(\omega t) + C_3\sin^4\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right)}\right], \tag{12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \frac{p^{N-1}}{2}, \\ C_2 &= \frac{p^{2N-2}}{4}(1 - 4p + 4p^2), \\ C_3 &= 4p^{N-1}(p^{N-1} - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, $\rho_{as}(t)$ is entangled if and only if λ is negative. Hence $|\lambda|$ serves as a measure of entanglement in $\rho_{as}(t)$. We define the entanglement measure for $\rho_{as}(t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} E(t) &= -\lambda(t) \quad : \text{ if } \lambda(t) < 0 \\ &= 0 \qquad\quad : \text{ if } \lambda(t) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We see that $\lambda(t)$ in Eq. (12) is periodic as well as continuous in t. Also $\lambda(0) = -0.5$. So if T is the time period of the function $\lambda(t)$, then $\lambda(T) = -0.5$. This clearly shows that, the negative values of $\lambda(t)$ varies with time in a non-monotonic manner. Thus, for any non-zero $\mathcal{E}$, the decay in $E(t)$ departs from monotonicity. This holds true irrespective of values of p and N. Figure 2 shows the fall of $E(t)$ with time. This departure from monotonicity is the Witness of non-Markovianity considered in this paper and it clearly shows that the system dynamics is non-Markovian. From the functional form in (3), it is clear that on increasing number of particles in the environment, frequency of this oscillation increases. So we can expect an increase in non-Markovian nature when the number of qubits in the environmentis increases. A numerical simulation of the above analysis was also done. Starting from numerical diagonalization of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (2) we found the negative eigenvalue of $\left[\rho_{as}(t)\right]^{T_s}$. On plotting $E(t)$ with time, we found in Figure 2 a plot which matches exactly with the aforesaid theoretically obtained plot.

B. Case II : Coupling, function of time and independent of site :

When, the coupling function $g_n(t)$ in expression (2), is independent of site n and is given by an *arbitrary* function of time [$= g(t)$ say], the Hamiltonians mutually commute at different times, and the analysis is same as in the last section. The only difference comes from the fact that $\mathcal{E}_{\pm}(t)$ in Eq. (3) are no longer constant. Thus in the expression of $\lambda(t)$ in Eq. (11), ωt is replaced by a term

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(t) = \frac{1}{\hbar}\int_0^t \mathcal{E}(\tau)d\tau &= \alpha\int_0^t \left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}|g_n(\tau)|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\tau \\ &= \alpha\sqrt{N}\int_0^t |g(\tau)|d\tau, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

If $g(t)$ is some polynomial function of t, we will get $\Omega(t)$ as a polynomial function of t. From the analysis in the last section we can see that, this will also give rise to a continuous and periodic $\lambda(t)$ and $\lambda(0) = -0.5$. Hence the dynamics will again be non-Markovian. If $g(t) = e^{-\gamma t}$, we have a possibility of getting Markovianity when real part of $\gamma = \gamma_r > 0$. When γ_r is negative we can see, as in the previous case, the dynamics is surely non-Markovian. When γ_r is positive non-Markovianity is witnessed if $\alpha\sqrt{N} \geq \gamma_r\pi$.

C. Case III : Coupling as a function of both time and site :

When $g_n(t)$ is both dependent on site n and time t, the Hamiltonian at different times don't commute with each other. In this scenario, solving for $\rho_{as}(t)$ becomes analytically quite difficult. So, we simulate the dynamics numerically. Note that this type of coupling represents



FIG. 2: Plot of system-ancilla entanglement as a function of time, for $N = 6$, $p = 0.6$ and $\alpha = 1$. This case in discussed in section III A.



FIG. 3: (colour online) Plot showing entanglement decay versus time for site-independent, time-dependent coupling. We take $\alpha = 1$. Blue curve for $g(t) = e^{-0.7t}$, red for $g(t) = e^{-2.7t}$ and black for $g(t) = t^{0.01}$. This case is discussed in section III B.

situations where the environment particles are in a relative motion with respect to the system.

1. Simulation Technique :

We first find out all the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (2). There are two non-zero eigenvalues. The corresponding eigenvectors are given in Eq. (4). $(N-1)$ of the rest of the eigenvectors (corresponding to zero eigenvalues) in the subspace spanned by $\{|0\rangle^{\otimes(N+1)}, |0\rangle_s \otimes |100..0\rangle_e, .., |0\rangle_s \otimes |000..1_n, ..0\rangle_e, .., |0\rangle_s \otimes |000..1\rangle_e\}$ are found by row reduction and Gram-Schmidt Orthonormalization techniques. The remaining $(2^N - N - 1)$ eigenvectors with zero eigenvalue are given in section II. Note that all the eigenvectors are time-dependent. The unitary operator giving rise to the evolution was found by the expression in Eq. (7). Once that is done, we evolve the initial ancilla -system-environment state $\rho_{ase}(t)$ by the unitary matrix $U_{ase}(t) = \mathbb{I}_a \otimes U_{se}(t)$ and get the time evolved state. The reduced state of system-ancilla is then used to find out the residual entanglement measure. As a verification of this technique we plot the decay of system-ancilla entanglement as a function of time for Case I (section III A) and it is seen that it perfectly matches with the theoretically obtained result.



FIG. 4: (colour online) Plot of entanglement vs time, for different coupling strengths γ_1 (section III C 2, when **(a)** $N = 3$, **(b)** $N = 8$. Here the environment is taken to be at zero temperature. We see that there is a transition from non-Markovianity to Markovianity as the coupling strength is made weaker and weaker.

2. Coupling $g_n(t) = e^{-\gamma_1 nt}$:

Here we will consider, $\alpha = 1$, $g_n(t) = e^{-\gamma_1 nt}$ in the Hamiltonian (2) and $\beta \to \infty$ in the initial environment state (5). We plot here the ancilla-system entanglement measure $E(t)$ as a function of time for different values of the coupling parameter γ_1 at a fixed value of N (number of qubits present in the environment). In Figure 4(a) and 4(b), monotonically decreasing entanglement



FIG. 5: Plot showing the transition values of γ_1 in section III C 2 as a function of number of environment qubits N for different values of environment temperature p



FIG. 6: (colour online) Plot showing entanglement between system and ancilla as a function of number of environment qubits N for initial temperature of the environment as zero, i.e., $p = 1$. This case is discussed in section III C 3.

values show signs of *possible* Markovianity of the system-environment dynamics and non-monotonic nature of entanglement decay are evidence of non-Markovianity. The figures clearly depict that after some time, the entanglement saturates to fixed values irrespective of their Markovian or non-Markovian nature. As expected, increasing the coupling parameter γ_1 i.e., decreasing coupling strength, leads to the transition from non-Markovian to possible Markovian dynamics. Next we find the extremal values of γ_1 for which non-Markovianity can be witnessed. These extremal values serve as transition parameters from non-Markovianity to possible Markovianity. On plotting these transition values with N (see Figure (5)) it appears that a saturation is reached as N is increased.

3. Coupling $g_n(t) = t^{-n\gamma}$:

We take the coupling function $g_n(t)$ in the above form and $\gamma = 0.3$ and $N = 4$. As shown in Figure (6) the dynamics is non-Markovian.

IV. CONCLUSION :

In this paper, we addressed the question of how non-Markovianity of a dynamics changes with the interaction between the system and the environment. We have taken a toy model constituting of a few qubits. But even in this minimalistic scenario, we are able to find a transition from non-Markovian to possible Markovian dynamics by tuning the system-environment interaction. We also found that if the interaction is independent of time, the dynamics is always non-Markovian. In the case of site-independent interaction, polynomial forms and certain cases of exponential forms show non-markovianity. Lastly, we study time-dependent and site-dependent interaction for certain forms of system-environment coupling. In this last case, we saw the transition from non-Markovianity to possible Markovianity. The transition values appear to saturate for larger numbers of environment qubits. Examining this type of spin environment is recently drawing some amount of interest [20]. Studies on similar lines was also done recently in [21], where an analysis of a qubit system interacting with a sea of spins was given. A number of questions arise from this study: whether such a transition can be found by considering more general forms of interaction, what happens if along with system-environment interaction, there is some interaction present among the environment particles, themselves. One may also find it useful to check, if the saturation of transition parameters, a general feature of interaction that exhibits non-Markovian to Markovian transition.

[1] H. P. Breuer, E. M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 021002 (2016).
[2] A. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Rep. Prog. Phys. **77**, 094001 (2014).
[3] C. Gardiner and P. Zoller, Quantum Noise, Springer Series in Synergetics (Springer, 2004).
[4] A. Royer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3272 (1996).
[5] A. Royer, Phys. Lett. A **315**, 335 (2003).
[6] B. Bylicka, D. Chruciski, and S. Maniscalco, Sci. Rep. **4**, 5720 (2014).
[7] Z. X. Man, Y. J. Xia, and Y. J. Xia, Sci. Rep. **5**, 13843 (2015).
[8] B. Bylicka, M. Tukiainen, D. Chruciski, J. Piilo, and S. Maniscalco, Sci. Rep. **6**, 27989 (2016).

[9] S. Schmidt, D. Blaschke, G. Röpke, A. V. Prozorkevich, S. A. Smolyansky, and V. D. Toneev, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 094005 (1999).
[10] J. C. R. Bloch, C. D. Roberts, and S. M. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 117502 (2000).
[11] P. Rebentrost and A. A. Guzik, J. Chem. Phys. **134**, 101103 (2011).
[12] B. H. Liu, L. Li, Y. F. Huang, C. F. Li, G. C. Guo, E. M. Laine, H. P. Breuer, and J. Piilo, Nat. Phys. **7**, 931 (2011).
[13] N. K. Bernardes, A. R. R. Carvalho, C. H. Monken, and M. F. Santos, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 032111 (2014).
[14] F. Brito and T. Werlang, New J. Phys. **17**, 072001 (2015).
[15] N. Garrido, T. Gorin, and C. Pineda, Phys. Rev. A **93**,012113 (2016).
[16] A. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010).
[17] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996).
[18] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
[19] R. Augusiak, M. Demianowicz, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 030301 (2008).
[20] N. V. Prokofév and P. C. E. Stamp, Rep. Prog. Phys. **63**, 669 (2000).
[21] S. Bhattacharya, A. Misra, C. Mukhopadhyay, and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 012122 (2017).